Community energy: entanglements of community, state and private sector

Creamer, E; Eadson, W; van Veelen, B; Pinker, A; Tingey, M; Braunholtz-Speight, T; Markantoni, M; Foden, M; Lacey-Barnacle, M

Published in:
Geography Compass

DOI:
10.1111/gec3.12378

First published: 28/06/2018

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

Community Energy: entanglements of community, state and private sector

Emily Creamer, Will Eadson, Bregje van Veelen, Annabel Pinker, Margaret Tingey, Tim Braunholtz-Speight, Marianna Markantoni, Mike Foden, Max Lacey-Barnacle

Abstract

The decarbonisation of energy systems is leading to a reconfiguration of the geographies of energy. One example is the emergence of community energy, which has become a popular object of study for geographers. Although widely acknowledged to be a contested, capacious and flexible term, 'community energy' is commonly presented as singular, bounded and localised. In this paper, we challenge this conception of community energy by considering evidence about the role and influence of three categories of actors: community; state; and private sector. We demonstrate how community energy projects are unavoidably entangled with a diversity of actors and institutions operating at and across multiple scales. We therefore argue that community energy is enabled and constituted by trans-scalar assemblages of overlapping actors, which demands multi-sectoral participation and coordination. We point to the need for further academic attention on the boundaries between these actors to better understand the role of different intermediary practices and relationships in facilitating the development of decentralised energy systems with just outcomes.

Keywords

Community energy; decentralised energy; energy transition; energy geographies; energy governance.

1. INTRODUCTION

Academic interest in community energy has been increasing for a decade. Early research focused primarily on understanding meanings of and attitudes towards community energy (e.g. Walker, Hunter, Devine-Wright, Evans & Fay, 2007; Walker & Devine-Wright 2008; Rogers, Simmons, Convery & Weatherall, 2008; Warren & McFayden, 2010), as well as exploring motivations for and barriers to participation (e.g. Walker, 2008; Hoffman & High-

Pippert, 2010; Bomberg & McEwen, 2012) and the potential for community initiatives to contribute to system-wide change (e.g. Hoffman & High-Pippert, 2005; Hielscher, Seyfang & Smith, 2011; Seyfang & Haxeltine, 2012). While these questions continue to have resonance today (e.g. Hicks and Ison, 2018; Becker, Kunze & Vancea, 2017), there has also been growing interest in the socio-political dimensions of community energy, most explicitly expressed through concepts of justice and democracy (e.g. Catney et al, 2014; McHarg, 2016; Simcock, 2016; Forman, 2017; Angel, 2017; van Veelen, 2018). This expanding body of community energy scholarship is international and interdisciplinary, with particular interest in Europe (e.g. Becker & Kunze 2014; Blanchet 2015; Bauwens, Gotchev & Holstenkamp 2016; Hall, Foxon & Bolton 2016; Islar & Busch 2016), especially the UK (e.g. Walker and Devine-Wright 2008; Middlemiss & Parrish 2010; Bomberg & McEwen 2012; Seyfang, Hielscher, Hargreaves, Martiskainen & Smith, 2014; Strachan, Cowell, Ellis, Sherry-Brennan & Toke, 2015; Simcock 2016; Markantoni 2016; van Veelen 2017). Much of this attention has come from geographers interested in community energy as a manifestation of "new ways – and new geographies – of producing, living, and working with energy" (Bridge, Bouzarovski, Bradshaw, & Eyre, 2013, p. 331) developing in response to the need to transition to low carbon economies (OECD, 2015).

A range of terminologies has emerged in different contexts to refer to various forms of locally led, collectively owned and managed energy projects, including: civic energy (de Vries, Boon, & Peine 2016; Hall et al 2016); citizen energy (Yildiz, 2014); grassroots energy (Blanchet, 2015; Haggett & Aitken, 2015; Kooij et al, 2018); local energy (Arentsen & Bellekom, 2014; Hoppe, Graf, Warbroek, Lammers & Lepping, 2015; Schwencke, 2017; Hasanov and Zuidema, 2018); and 'collective and politically-motivated energy' (Becker & Kunze, 2014). Nevertheless, in the UK, 'community energy' is the most prevalent term used in both policy and practice, and it has become the dominant term within the international academic literature (Kunze & Becker, 2015; Seyfang et al, 2014). The explicit connection between 'energy' and 'community' may particularly attract geographers to the concept of

community energy by focusing attention on the influence modes of energy production and distribution have on acts of place-making, and the ways spatial identities affect processes and criteria through which the legitimacy of staking a claim in, or profiting from, a specific energy project is negotiated (Calvert, 2016; Cowell, Bristow, & Munday, 2011; Murphy & Smith, 2013).

Despite the development of community energy as a distinct research object, 'community energy' continues to be used ambiguously and flexibly both in practice and literature (Becker & Kunze 2014; Klein and Coffey 2016). Energy can be decentralised in many ways, and community energy encompasses projects of varying scale, complexity and socio-technical organisation, embedded within diverse social contexts (Pohlmann 2018; Chmutina & Goodier, 2014; van Veelen, 2017). Projects vary significantly according to the parts of the energy system they seek to influence, with different activities addressing how energy is *generated*, how it is it is moved around (*transmission* and *distribution*), and how it is sold (*supply*) to end users (*demand* for energy). Governance and ownership models also vary. Differences in how projects are controlled, owned and financed translate into differences in civic actors' roles, and the degrees of risk, return, and responsibility for communities of community energy (Haggett, Creamer, Harnmeijer, Parsons, & Bomberg, 2013). Moreover, community energy is not the product of community endeavours alone. Community energy is enabled and constituted by trans-scalar assemblages of overlapping and heterogeneously-configured actors.

This article therefore aims to challenge framings of 'community energy' as singular, bounded and localised by exploring the role and influence of three categories of actor in 'community energy': state; private sector; and community. Whilst we address these actors separately for clarity, we take them as overlapping, non-unitary and contested domains. We highlight the differences in needs, constraints and ambitions of these different actors and argue that, to date, insufficient attention has been paid to the fuzzy but productive boundaries between them.

This is not a systematic review of community energy literature. Instead, we draw on literature selectively to enable us to examine these different actors and highlight the interplays between them. We focus on the UK, because it bounds the review to a specific sociotechnical energy system configuration, and because a large proportion of the community energy scholarship has been conducted within the UK. Whilst we draw on selected European, North American and Australian scholarship comparatively to illuminate specific resonances and contrasts with the UK case, we have excluded literature on decentralised energy in developing countries. Although we recognise the value in incorporating this perspective, significant differences in sociotechnical infrastructure systems and socio-political-economic and historical contexts adds a complexity that puts this beyond the scope of this paper.

We take each actor category in turn, considering evidence of the ways they constitute and configure community energy projects, and factors influencing this role. We then bring these observations together to reflect on how framing community energy as a product of entanglements between these different actors helps to expose the role of intermediary practices in the development of decentralised energy systems and the need for more nuanced understanding of processes through which more democratic and inclusive outcomes are achieved through community energy.

2. THE COMMUNITY

Communities are engaged in a broad range of energy activities, including electricity and heat generation (from a range of sources), energy efficiency and demand management, collective purchasing, storage, transport, and education and awareness raising[1]. Community energy is commonly differentiated from non-community energy by the (assumed) level of participation and involvement of community members in the process of developing a project and/or the

[1] For examples of successful community energy projects in the UK see https://communityenergyengland.org/pages/case-studies (England) and http://www.communityenergyscotland.org.uk/case-studies.asp (Scotland)

outcomes of the project (van Veelen, 2017). Although some (e.g. Walker & Devine-Wright, 2008) use this 'process-outcome' approach to map the broad variety of community projects that may exist, others adopt a normative perspective, where 'more' (participation or benefits flowing into the community) is better (e.g. Callaghan & Williams, 2014). This is one explanation for the substantial body of empirical research on community energy focusing on understanding factors that encourage and facilitate participation in energy projects (e.g. Bomberg & McEwen, 2012; Park, 2012; Rogers, Simmons, Convery, & Weatherall, 2012a; Walker, 2008). Across this literature, scholars have particularly noted the importance of identification with a place-based community in facilitating participation: a sense of belonging to a particular place is observed to inspire voluntary efforts to develop community renewable energy to generate local benefits (Bomberg & McEwen, 2012; Haggett & Aitken, 2015; Rogers, Simmons, Convery, & Weatherall, 2012b; van Veelen & Haggett, 2016). This sense of belonging and place attachment has been observed to be mutually reinforced through participation in community projects (Haf & Parkhill, 2017; Hoffman & High-Pippert, 2010; Kalkbrenner & Roosen, 2016; van der Horst, 2008). For example, Haf and Parkhill (2017) found that the four community energy projects they studied in Scotland and Wales were driven by cultural values, but also contributed to the cultural sustainability of local areas through encouraging retention of Scottish Gaelic and Welsh languages.

Community is not necessarily place-based, and various legal structures are used to constitute different types of community groups. A group's legal structure – as well as its activities – can influence the potential impact of the project and inform interactions with society at multiple scales, including the degree and form of local participation (Devine-Wright & Wiersma, 2013). Some models of community energy rely on engaging a large number of residents in the local geographic community, whereas others depend more or less actively involved financial investors (Kalkbrenner & Roosen, 2016). In the UK, groups can adopt the structure of a Community Benefit Society, Community Interest Company, Co-operative society, Limited Company or other charitable legal models. Community Benefit Societies

serve the interests of their local community, whereas Co-operatives serve the interests of their members, who can be geographically dispersed (van Veelen, 2017).

Despite, or perhaps because of, the fact that 'community' is embedded within community energy, what constitutes community in community energy has arguably been taken for granted or inadequately unpacked in much of the literature (Devine-Wright & Wiersma, 2013). 'Community' commonly invokes feelings of "warmth, belonging, and comfort" (Evans, 2010: 33). As a result, there is a tendency to make normative assumptions about the inherent moral and ethical 'goodness' of community energy (Taylor Aiken, 2014; 2015). Community energy has been assigned a central role in new literatures on energy democracy and justice (Catney et al, 2014; McHarg 2016; Simcock 2016; Forman 2017; Angel 2017; van Veelen, 2018) and is associated with helping to give voice to those disenfranchised by existing energy system configurations (Wirth, 2014). It is argued that, through community participation, decisions around energy are more inclusive, decision-makers are more representative, and there is greater opportunity to hold decision-makers to account (Kunze & Becker, 2015; Vansintjan, 2015; Weinrub & Giancatarino, 2015).

The capaciousness of the term 'community energy' can be valuable for communities. It enables experimentation with different models (Walker & Devine-Wright, 2008) and allows for a wide range of practices to emerge, dependent on, and sensitive to, particular contexts (Becker & Kunze, 2014; Pohlmann, 2018). In her study of three community energy projects in Scotland and Germany, Pohlmann observed that a multitude of different interests, ideas, knowledge, and norms shaped the projects. For one project, energy production was used as a way to generate money to realise the community's broader interests. For another, the project was used to directly challenge the existing energy system. For the third, the project was a means to raise international attention for the city and become a symbol for the production of renewable energies in the district. In each case, the communities were able to 'make sense of' community energy in a way met their particular needs.

There is a growing strand of critical research on community energy highlighting that simply adding the prefix 'community' does not necessarily lead to just or democratic outcomes. Community energy does not, in itself, generate progressive or regressive effects; it is the way that it is mobilised and enacted that matters (Berka & Creamer, 2018). It has been observed that, typically, only a relatively small number of highly active community members are necessary to initiate and manage a community energy project (Hoffman and High-Pippert, 2010). Fostering and sustaining participation in community energy projects has been found to be challenging, particularly given the apparent pervasiveness of individualism in everyday social interactions (Mulugetta, Jackson, & van der Horst, 2010). Kalkbrenner and Roosen (2016) note that low willingness to participate in local energy projects is partly due to "free-riding" as "positive outcomes, such as environmental benefits, are distributed amongst participants as well as non-participants" (p.61). As Hoffman and High-Pippert (2010) suggest, sustained participation is therefore likely to be motivated less by personal benefit than by an appreciation of community-wide benefits.

Community energy is commonly assumed to deliver a range of positive social outcomes locally (Bere, Jones, Jones, & Munday, 2017; Callaghan & Williams, 2014; Gubbins, 2010; Hicks & Ison, 2011; Seyfang, Park, & Smith, 2013), and there is evidence to suggest that economic and social outcomes are at least as important as environmental concerns in motivating community energy projects (DECC 2014a; Haggett, et al., 2013; Hargreaves, Hielscher, Seyfang & Smith, 2013; Islar & Busch, 2016). However, in a recent systematic review, Berka and Creamer (2018) found little robust empirical evidence of social benefits being generated in practice.[2] Moreover, participation is not guaranteed to be a positive experience with a positive outcome for all (Callaghan & Williams, 2014; Middlemiss & Parrish, 2010); nor is it automatically equitable. As Park (2012) and Catney et al. (2014) have demonstrated, varying levels of community capacity and social capital within

[2] Several community energy organisations are currently collaborating to design a standardised 'monitoring and evaluation tool' aimed at producing such evidence. See https://www.pureleapfrog.org/monitoring-and-evaluation for more details.

187 communities may support or greatly inhibit local energy action on the ground, with
188 participatory opportunities often taken up by those in higher socio-economic groups
189 (Grossmann & Creamer, 2017; Angel, 2017). Consequently, there are fears that community
190 energy is more accessible to affluent and able communities - or individuals within those
191 communities - reflecting wider political issues concerning the role of social class, socio-
192 economic division and regional and spatial inequalities that underpin broader systemic
193 inequalities in the UK (Catney et al., 2014; Johnson & Hall, 2014; Park, 2012). Here, the role
194 and influence of the community meets, and becomes entangled with, the role of the state.

195 ## 3. THE STATE

196 ### 3.1 Central government

197 The actions of central government institutions are critical to the development of community
198 energy projects. State funding and subsidy mechanisms, planning regimes, political
199 commitment to low carbon energy transitions and arrangements for devolved decision-
200 making all have significant influence (Walker, 2008). Less visibly, policy measures are both
201 shaped by and serve to reproduce culturally-specific social norms, understandings and
202 priorities, with direct and indirect consequences for the acceptance and normalisation of
203 community energy (Bomberg & McEwen, 2012; Taylor Aiken, 2014).

204 In the UK, the roots of the community energy policy under the 1997-2010 Labour
205 government were argued to be largely driven by instrumental objectives, with community as
206 a vehicle for achieving these objectives. Walker et al (2007) found three factors were
207 particularly appealing for UK policy makers. First, an understanding that channelling benefits
208 to local residents helped mitigate opposition to proposed wind farm developments. Second,
209 the not-for-profit legal status of community-based bodies meant they could directly receive
210 government subsidies whilst circumventing European rules on state-aid, and help to
211 stimulate the renewables market. And third, the recognition that renewable energy projects
212 could generate new sources of income and employment for areas experiencing “agricultural

decline, depopulation and economic collapse" (Walker et al., 2007, p. 73). There was also *some* aspiration to embed participatory approaches in decision-making on energy production, also evident under the 'localist' rhetoric of the Liberal Democrat-led approach to community energy under the 2010-2015 Coalition government (Catney et al., 2014), culminating in the UK's first Community Energy Strategy (DECC, 2014b, 2015; see also Smith, Hargreaves, Hielscher, Martiskainen, & Seyfang, 2016).

The role of central government engagement with community energy goes beyond its ability to effectively catalyse or stymie civil society goals, and contributions have critically analysed how governmental programmes interact with and shape the activities of community-led initiatives, producing a trans-scalar politics of community energy (Bomberg & McEwen 2012; Nolden 2013; Catney et al 2014; Oteman, Wiering & Helderman, 2014; Markantoni 2016; van Veelen 2017). A strand of recent research has interrogated the effects of governmental intervention on actions, behaviours and outcomes of community energy protagonists. A common theme is to focus on how governmental rationalities and conceptualisations of community energy interact with sometimes divergent understandings among those seeking to develop community energy projects. The impacts of funding criteria and governmental accounting regimes, for instance, are said to have shaped the work of grassroots energy and sustainability movements in the UK (Creamer, 2015; Hauxwell-Baldwin, 2013; Taylor Aiken, 2016). This has profoundly changed the dynamic of community energy for many projects, with increased emphasis on quantifying inputs, outputs and outcomes exemplifying what Taylor Aiken (2016, p.28) terms 'governing through numbers'. In his exploration of the Scottish Government's Climate Challenge Fund, Taylor Aiken describes a dramatic change in the operations of one neighbourhood community group after receiving funding and becoming entangled in the various practices of governing this entailed, such as meeting prescriptive legal and financial arrangements, to the everyday action of recording and *counting* activities, output and outcomes.

The rise of governmental interest in community energy has also brought charges of co-option of 'community' as a policy object leading to a narrowing of the diverse manifestations of community to elision *with* local, apolitical action. It has been argued that many of the UK government's 'community' energy policy mechanisms have instead been aimed at marketising communities or using community as a misnomer for 'meta-individual' activities (Aiken, 2012; Eadson & Foden, 2014; Hauxwell-Baldwin, 2013): "These policies promote the primacy of economic and market goals ahead of the idea of community as collective relations, which is fundamentally 'not individual'" (Eadson, 2016, p. 1625). This juxtaposes the focus on social relations, identity and normative values within community groups (Hauxwell-Baldwin, 2013).

The past decade has produced many comparative studies of contrasting policy approaches to renewable energy in different countries (e.g. Hoppe et al, 2015; White, Lunnan, Nybakk & Kulisic, 2013; Sovacool, 2011; Toke, Breukers, & Wolsink, 2008) and differing 'institutional space' these create for community energy (Oteman et al, 2014). Danish and German governments are noted for being particularly supportive of civil society engagement with energy systems, combining progressive approaches to decarbonisation and energy transitions with longer held commitment to municipal, citizen and civil society involvement in decision-making (Bolinger, 2001). For example, KfW, the German government-owned development bank, provides low interest loans distributed through networks of local and regional banks which have been instrumental in the growth of locally and cooperatively owned renewable energy in Germany (Hall et al, 2016). There were almost 1,000 renewable energy cooperatives in Germany in 2014 (Brummer & Herbes 2018) – a significant growth from 136 cooperatives six years earlier (Hoppe et al. 2015).

It is important to note that central government institutions are not necessarily monolithic, unified or stable. Policy arrangements must be viewed as merely 'temporary stabilisation[s]... in continual flux' (Arts, Leroy, & van Tatenhove, 2006: 96). Furthermore, national governments are themselves marked by competing interests and priorities, within and

between departments. For example, in the UK, the dissolution of the Department for Energy and Climate Change and the creation of a new Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy in 2016 was met with some concern that policy to address climate change might be undermined by ambitions for economic growth (Watson, 2016).

There is also scope for regions with devolved powers to design energy policies that differ from or go further than national policies. For example, the Scottish Government – with its own target to achieve 1GW of renewable energy capacity in community and local ownership by 2020 and 2GW by 2030 (Scottish Government, 2017) – has launched various measures to support community energy in Scotland since 2002. The provision of grants and loans is enhanced by a range of general support and intermediary organisations designed to increase community engagement in low carbon transitions (see Markantoni and Woolvin 2015 for the key Scottish community funding initiatives). Experiences in several northern European countries, particularly Germany, Denmark and Sweden, also demonstrate that the governing context at *local* government scale is a key factor in understanding the development of community energy spanning the management of roles, responsibilities, and relationships between different scales of government.

3.2 Local government

In several northern European countries, municipalities have taken a leading role in driving forward decentralised energy systems (Webb, Tingey, & Hawkey, 2017). As well as being the scale of government which interacts most with local civil society actors, local government has a commitment to locality and place. Municipal government is, therefore, often framed as more accessible than central government to those pursuing community energy initiatives and more engaged with local priorities (Warbroek & Hoppe, 2017).

Hoppe et al. (2015) highlight the potential impact of local government leadership in their analysis of two ‘best practice’ local energy initiatives in Lochem in the Netherlands and Saerbeck in Germany. Counter to common ‘bottom-up’ or ‘grassroots’ narratives about

community energy projects, these projects had been “to a large extent initiated by public officials… [and] success in large part was due to active, involved public leadership” (Hoppe et al., 2015, pp.1917-1918). In some cases, development of community energy initiatives has catalysed a reworking of relationships between civil society and local government through politicisation of energy provision. For example, in Germany, the rising number of community energy cooperatives as part of the country’s high profile *Energiewende*, has stimulated larger scale citizen-led movements seeking to re-municipalise heat, gas and electricity grids in Hamburg and Berlin into German public ownership[3] (Becker, Naumann & Moss, 2017; Becker, Blanchet, & Kunze, 2016; Blanchet, 2015; Kunze & Becker, 2015; Moss, Becker, & Naumann, 2015).

In Denmark and Sweden, local government has a well-institutionalised role within the energy system and established legislated responsibilities in energy planning and a history of ownership and operation of energy provision and services. Hence, municipal and community energy companies in these countries contribute to more diverse market in energy services, working ‘in-against-and-beyond the state’ (Angel, 2017; see also Becker, Naumann & Moss, 2016). By contrast, in the UK, energy expertise, resources and assets are concentrated in large, mainly transnational, corporations with primary responsibility to shareholders, meaning local authorities have more limited institutional capacity for energy (Webb, Hawkey, & Tingey, 2016). Not only has energy generation and supply been progressively centralised and privatised in the UK (Chick, 2007), local government also has less fiscal and decision-making autonomy to control local services overall (twinned with fewer resources conferred to energy). Consequently, recent research has found considerable variation in the extent of activity and planning across UK local authority action on energy (Tingey, Hawkey, & Webb, 2016; Webb et al, 2016, 2017).

[3] The energy grids in both Hamburg and Berlin have been operated by Vattenfall, which is owned by the Swedish state

Where local governments do not take a leading role in developing energy projects, they can nevertheless be important players in partnerships with civil society-led energy projects (Castán Broto & Bulkeley, 2013). In the UK, examples include Bath & West Community Energy, Low Carbon Hub (Oxford), Plymouth Energy Community (PEC), and Swansea Community Energy (Webb et al, 2017). In these cases, Local Authorities supported community energy project through innovative use of council resources, including access buildings to host solar panels as well as access to finance, staff time and expertise. The political priorities of these Local Authorities favoured community ownership and stemmed from councils' history of sustainable development work, as well as recent enabling powers. Supporting community energy was also considered a route to local engagement and community responsibility for assets, and a source of opportunities for training, skills development and empowerment, which was important in the face of dwindling council resources.

Local Authorities and community groups may also co-invest. For example, Public Power Solutions (wholly owned by Swindon Council) engaged in partnership with Abundance (a green economy investment platform) to co-finance Swindon Community Solar Farm from a mix of public finance and community investment (Crisp, 2016). Local Authorities generally benefit from scale of assets, access to land and planning powers, and can therefore enable more straightforward replication of business development for local ownership. Increasingly, community projects in the UK have opportunities to partner with private sector actors, which – while not without challenges – has proved successful in several cases (Goedkoop & Devine-Wright, 2016; Vaughan-Morris, McNaught, Morris & Cheung, 2015). However, it is argued that the nature of UK energy supply regulation plays a significant role in preventing small-scale companies from entering the market (Hall & Roelich, 2015). Here, the role and influence of state and community actors meets, and becomes entangled with, the role of private market actors.

4. THE PRIVATE SECTOR

Private sector actors, such as energy utilities, developers and independent consultants, have a complex and powerful influence on community and local energy projects (Rydin et al., 2015), and there are important considerations to make about the extent to which market actors and market-based rationalities shape the ways in which community energy is conceived, mobilised and enacted.

Community energy projects are market actors themselves (Eadson, 2016), typically as companies engaged in one or more of the core 'energy chain' activities of generation, distribution, and supply. In the UK, energy generation, distribution and retail are currently dominated by a few vertically-integrated energy utilities, the 'Big Six' (Koh & Groucher, 2014; Shrubsole & Cameron, 2014), and their dominance affects the operations of ancillary companies (such as manufacturers of equipment or providers of finance) and the structure of the whole energy market. Community energy ventures, commonly classified as 'Non-Traditional Business Models' (Ofgem 2015), are typically small scale and new to the challenges of managing an energy project. Consequently, these organisations may lack capacity to interact with large institutions in a way that is as timely and cost-effective as larger private sector energy developers (DECC, 2014a). Equally, market actors whose systems are organised around dealing with larger scale projects and more established companies may not consider it cost-effective to engage with community groups. This applies to suppliers of technologies, such as wind turbines (Gubbins, 2007), as well as providers of services including finance (Hall et al., 2016; DECC, 2014a). For financial institutions, community energy projects are often unattractive investments, not only because of their size but also because of their geographical embeddedness as they tend to be single project, single location initiatives, unable to spread the risk of project failure across multiple projects and locations.

The broad international trend towards more decentralised energy generation (OECD, 2015) is likely to force changes in large energy companies and provide additional market

opportunities for community energy actors. Funkhouser, Blackburn, Magee, & Rai (2015) suggest that, in the USA, large energy companies are already major promoters of community solar, seeing collective energy projects as more easily integrated into their business models than widespread adoption of 'behind the meter' rooftop solar PV. There are also some initial signs of cooperative action between energy companies and communities in the UK. For example, energy company OVO Energy have established an 'OVO Communities' division, which seeks to develop local energy schemes across England. To date, they have partnered with three local authorities and a social housing consortium to offer advice and expertise to energy schemes that address fuel poverty and prioritise local energy tariffs for local residents, demonstrating an innovative partnership between cross-sectoral actors (OVO Energy, 2018).

Despite the challenges portrayed in much of the UK literature, energy markets can be made to work for community energy; community energy may even have some advantages compared to private sector actors. There is some evidence that community or locally-owned renewable energy projects have greater success in the land use planning process than privately-owned projects, although other factors are also important (Szarka & Bludhorn, 2006; Bauwens et al., 2016; Warren & McFadyen, 2010). Community energy may also be able to operate with lower financial returns than private sector investors (Vaughan-Morris et al., 2015). While community energy project costs appear to vary more than comparable private sector projects, they are not necessarily higher (Harnmeijer et al., 2015). Smaller actors' power to raise finance and lessen their dependence on larger financial institutions has also been enhanced by widespread access to the internet (Davis & Braunholtz-Speight, 2016; Yildiz, 2014).

5. DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

This review of community energy from three perspectives has sought to demonstrate that it is not possible to consider community energy as an entity (or set of entities) in isolation.

Community energy projects are unavoidably entangled with a range of different actors and institutions operating at and across scales. These projects demand multi-sectoral participation and the coordination of governments, public and private institutions, and communities (Mulugetta et al, 2010). It is partly by virtue of the new partnerships, networks and relationships engendered in this way that community energy initiatives have the potential to contribute to social and political transformation (Pinker, 2018). Understanding the different roles that these actors and institutions play in the development of community energy projects is essential to understanding the sector as a whole.

Communities, however defined, cannot achieve large scale, socio-technical reconfiguration single-handedly, but must be facilitated by a mixture of top-down policy and bottom-up initiatives, generating “heterogeneous actor constellations and organisational landscapes” (Moss et al., 2015, p. 1560). In this paper we have considered some of the interactions and contestations between this plurality of actors, above all highlighting the complex effects of institutional context and trans-scalar politics on how community energy emerges. Even within the relatively homogeneous setting of north-western Europe, there is significant variation in nationally- and locally-specific governance arrangements and their underlying norms and assumptions. For example, in Germany and Denmark priorities are observed to be relatively coherent and consistent between scales of governance, impacting positively on the degree of cooperation towards shared goals between community organisers, market actors, and national, regional and local governments. By contrast, in the UK, as well as Belgium and the Netherlands, approaches to renewable energy policy are identified to be less strategic, more market-led developments and greater dissonance between governmental and community priorities, which coincides with smaller and less developed community energy sectors (Bauwens et al, 2016; Breukers & Wolsink, 2007; Kooij et al 2018; Nolden, 2013; Oteman et al, 2014).

There is a growing recognition of the potential role that effective intermediary organisations can play at the boundaries between public, private, and community actors, encouraging and

enabling new relationships in a complex context (Bush et al. 2017). A diverse array of non-governmental intermediary organisations has emerged to mediate between communities, private and state actors. These intermediaries have been observed to support community energy groups in the development of a project, translating policy objectives to the local level, and helping develop and nurture the types of network-oriented strategies required to 'jump scale' and enact change beyond the local scale (Bird & Barnes, 2014; Hargreaves, Hielscher, Seyfang, & Smith, 2013; Parag, Hamilton, White, & Hogan, 2013; Seyfang et al., 2014; Strachan et al, 2015). In some instances, local authorities can take on an intermediary role, making use of their 'trusted brand identity' (Webb at al, 2017) to assist in scaling-up community activity. With respect to developing district heating, this role has been observed to include "persuading local stakeholders of the value of district heating, and building the social networks required to deliver projects" (Bush et al., 2017, p.143), both externally (facilitating cooperation between local, public and private sector stakeholders) and internally (encouraging cooperation across the local authority).

Despite the increasing recognition of the importance of intermediaries in facilitating local and community energy initiatives, this type of boundary work remains under-researched (Bush et al., 2017; Hodson, Marvin, & Bulkeley, 2013). Literature on the roles of intermediaries is dominated by authors adopting a multi-level perspective to sociotechnical transitions, analysing the role these organisations play in niche nurturing (Hargreaves et al., 2013; Kivimaa, 2014). There would be value in research that sought to further unpick nuances in the practices, relationships and influence of different intermediary actors, building on existing work, such as Hodson et al's. (2013) analysis of the 'modes of intermediation' in urban low carbon transitions.

Ultimately, as Becker and Kunze (2014) have argued, the term 'community energy' may not be the most appropriate to describe these increasingly complex, trans-scalar decentralised energy arrangements in which state, private, and community actors collide. As multi-sector coalitions become more prevalent, there is a danger that the manifestation and position of

community actors become increasingly obscure, to the point that the 'community' of 'community energy' becomes an empty signifier, arbitrarily defined (Rogers et al., 2012a), and little more than a means of garnering legitimacy for potentially controversial renewable energy projects (Pinker, 2018). Recent community energy scholarship utilising the emerging concepts of 'energy justice' and 'energy democracy' to interrogate normative assumptions about participation and the relationship between community energy and normative ideals of democracy and justice (e.g. Rasch & Kohne 2017; Becker & Naumann, 2017; Forman, 2017; McHarg, 2016; Simcock, 2016; van Veelen 2018) is therefore welcomed. There remains, however, significant scope for further conceptual and empirical work on the intersection between participation and inclusion in material systems in the context of plural and dynamic understandings of community energy, including the types of participation enabled and the connection between inclusive participation and just outcomes.

Acknowledgements

Removed for peer review

References

Aiken, G. (2012). Community Transitions to Low Carbon Futures in the Transition Towns Network (TTN). *Geography Compass*, *6*(2), 89–99.

Angel, J. (2017). Towards an Energy Politics In-Against-and-Beyond the State: Berlin's Struggle for Energy Democracy. *Antipode*, *49,* 557-576.

Arentsen, M. & Bellekom, S. (2014). Power to the people: local energy initiatives as seedbeds of innovation? Energy. *Sustainability and Society, 4(2)*, 1-12.

Arts, B., Leroy, P. & van Tatenhove, J. (2006). Political Modernisation and Policy Arrangements: A Framework for Understanding Environmental Policy Change. *Public Organization Review, 6*, 39-106.

Bauwens, T., Gotchev, B. & Holstenkamp, L. (2016). What drives the development of community energy in Europe? The case of wind power cooperatives. *Energy Research and Social Science*, *13*, 136–147. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2015.12.016

Becker, S., Blanchet, T. & Kunze, C. (2016). Social movements and urban energy policy: Assessing contexts, agency and outcomes of remunicipalisation processes in Hamburg and Berlin. *Utilities Policy*, *41*, 228–236. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jup.2016.02.001

Becker, S. & Kunze, C. (2014). Transcending community energy: collective and politically motivated projects in renewable energy (CPE) across Europe. *People, Place and Policy Online*, *8*(3), 180–191. http://doi.org/10.3351/ppp.0008.0003.0004

Becker, S., Kunze, C. & Vancea, N. (2017). Community energy and social entrepreneurship: Addressing purpose, organisation and embeddedness of renewable energy projects. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 147(20), 25-36. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.01.048

Becker, S. & Naumann, M. (2017). Energy democracy: Mapping the debate on energy alternatives. *Geography Compass*, *11*(8), 1–13. http://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12321

Becker, S., Naumann, M. & Moss, T. (2017). Between coproduction and commons: understanding initiatives to reclaim urban energy provision in Berlin and Hamburg. *Urban Research and Practice, 10*, 63-85. https://doi.org/10.1080/17535069.2016.1156735

Bere, J., Jones, C., Jones, S. & Munday, M. (2017). Energy and development in the periphery: A regional perspective on small hydropower projects. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space, 35*, 355-375.

Berka, A. L. & Creamer, E. (2018). Taking stock of the local impacts of community owned renewable energy: A review and research agenda. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 82(3), 3400–3419. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2017.10.050

Bird, C. & Barnes, J. (2014). Scaling up community activism : the role of intermediaries in collective approaches to community energy, 208–221. http://doi.org/10.3351/ppp.0008.0003.0006.

Blanchet, T. (2015). Struggle over energy transition in Berlin: How do grassroots initiatives affect local energy policy-making? *Energy Policy*, *78*, 246–254. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2014.11.001

Bolinger, M. (2001). Community Wind Power Ownership Schemes in Europe and their Relevance to the United States. California: Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.

Bomberg, E. & McEwen, N. (2012). Mobilizing community energy. *Energy Policy*, *51*, 435–444. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2012.08.045

Breukers, S. & Wolsink, M. (2007). Wind power implementation in changing institutional landscapes: An international comparison. *Energy Policy*, *35*(5), 2737–2750. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2006.12.004

Bridge, G., Bouzarovski, S., Bradshaw, M. & Eyre, N. (2013). Geographies of energy transition: Space, place and the low-carbon economy. *Energy Policy*, *53*, 331–340. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2012.10.066

Brummer V. & Herbes C. (2018). Of expertise, social capital, and democracy: Assessing the organizational governance and decision-making in German Renewable Energy Cooperatives. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci*. 37 (March) p111–121

Bush, R. E., Bale, C. S. E., Powell, M., Gouldson, A., Taylor, P. G. & Gale, W. F. (2017). The role of intermediaries in low carbon transitions – Empowering innovations to unlock district heating in the UK. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *148*, 137–147. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.01.129

Callaghan, G. & Williams, D. (2014). Teddy bears and tigers: How renewable energy can revitalise local communities. *Local Economy*, *29*(6–7), 657–674. http://doi.org/10.1177/0269094214551254

Calvert, K. (2016). From “energy geography” to “energy geographies.” *Progress in Human Geography*, *40*(1), 105–125. http://doi.org/10.1177/0309132514566343

Castán Broto, V. & Bulkeley, H. (2013). A survey of urban climate change experiments in 100 cities. *Global Environmental Change*, 23, 92–102. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2012.07.005

Catney, P., MacGregor, S., Dobson, A., Hall, S. M., Royston, S., Robinson, Z., Ormerod, M. & Ross, S. (2014). Big society, little justice? Community renewable energy and the politics of localism. *Local Environment*, *19*(7), 715–730. http://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2013.792044

Chick, M. (2007). *Electricity and Energy Policy in Britain, France and the United States since 1945*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Chmutina, K. & Goodier, C. I. (2014). Alternative future energy pathways: Assessment of the potential of innovative decentralised energy systems in the UK. *Energy Policy*, *66*, 62–72. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2013.10.080

Cowell, R., Bristow, G. & Munday, M. (2011). Acceptance, acceptability and environmental justice: the role of community benefits in wind energy development. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, *54*(4), 539–557. http://doi.org/10.1080/09640568.2010.521047

Creamer, E. (2015). The double-edged sword of grant funding: a study of community-led climate change initiatives in remote rural Scotland. *Local Environment*, *20*(9), 981–999. http://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2014.885937

545 Crisp, N. (2016). Swindon community solar farm powers up thanks to unique solar bond
546 initiative. *Public Power Solutions*. Available online:
547 https://www.publicpowersolutions.co.uk/swindon-community-solar-farm-powers-up-
548 thanks-to-unique-solar-bond-initiative/

549 Davis, M. and Braunholtz-Speight, T. (2016). *Financial Innovation Today: Towards*
550 *Economic Resilience.* York: Friends Provident Foundation.

551 de Vries, G.W., Boon, W.P.C. & Peine, A. (2016). User-led innovation in civic energy
552 communities. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 19, 51-65.

553 DECC [Department of Energy & Climate Change] (2014a). *Community energy in the UK Part*
554 *2: Final report*. DECC: London.

555 DECC [Department of Energy & Climate Change] (2014b). *Community Energy Strategy: Full*
556 *Report*. DECC: London.

557 DECC [Department of Energy & Climate Change] (2015). *Community Energy Strategy*
558 *Update: Creating the conditions for long-term growth*. DECC: London.

559 Devine-Wright, P. & Wiersma, B. (2013). Opening up the “local” to analysis: exploring the
560 spatiality of UK urban decentralised energy initiatives. *Local Environment*, *18*(November),
561 1099–1116. http://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2012.754742

562 Eadson, W. (2016). State enrolment and energy-carbon transitions: Syndromic
563 experimentation and atomisation in England. *Environment and Planning C: Government*
564 *and Policy*, *34*(8), 1612–1631. http://doi.org/10.1177/0263774X16629445

565 Eadson, W. & Foden, M. (2014). Editorial: critical perspectives on community energy.
566 *People, Place and Policy Online*, *8*(3), 145–148.
567 http://doi.org/10.3351/ppp.0008.0003.0001

568 Forman, A. (2017). Energy justice at the end of the wire: Enacting community energy and
569 equity in Wales. *Energy Policy*, 107, 649-657. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2017.05.006

570 Funkhouser, E., Blackburn, G., Magee, C. & Rai, V. (2015). Business model innovations for
571 deploying distributed generation: the emerging landscape of community solar in the US.
572 *Energy Research and Social Science, 10,* 90-101.

573 Goedkoop, F. & Devine-Wright, P. (2016). Partnership or placation? The role of trust and
574 justice in the shared ownership of renewable energy projects. *Energy Research & Social*
575 *Science*, *17*, 135–146. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2016.04.021

576 Grossmann, M. & Creamer, E. (2017). Assessing diversity and inclusivity within the
577 Transition movement: an urban case study. *Environmental Politics*, *26*(1), 161–182.
578 http://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2016.1232522

579 Gubbins, N. (2007). Community Energy in Practice. *Local Economy*, *22*(1), 80–84.
580 http://doi.org/10.1080/02690940601121336

581 Gubbins, N. (2010). The role of community energy schemes in supporting community
582 resilience. *JRF briefing paper on Community Assets*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation: York.

583 Haf, S. & Parkhill, K. (2017). The Muillean Gaoithe and the Melin Wynt: Cultural
584 sustainability and community owned wind energy schemes in Gaelic and Welsh speaking
585 communities in the United Kingdom. *Energy Research and Social Science*, *29*(February),
586 103–112. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2017.05.017

587 Haggett, C. & Aitken, M. (2015). Grassroots Energy Innovations: the Role of Community
588 Ownership and Investment. *Current Sustainable/Renewable Energy Reports*, *2*(3), 98–
589 104. http://doi.org/10.1007/s40518-015-0035-8

590 Haggett, C., Creamer, E., Harnmeijer, J., Parsons, M. & Bomberg, E. (2013). *Community*
591 *Energy in Scotland : the Social Factors for Success*. ClimateXChange: Edinburgh.

592 Hall, S., Foxon, T. J. & Bolton, R. (2016). Financing the civic energy sector: How financial
593 institutions affect ownership models in Germany and the United Kingdom. *Energy*
594 *Research and Social Science*, *12*, 5–15. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2015.11.004

595 Hall, S. & Roelich, K.E., (2016). Business model innovation in electricity supply markets: the
596 role of complex value in the United Kingdom. *Energy Policy, 92*, 286-298.
597 doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2016.02.019

598 Hargreaves, T., Hielscher, S., Seyfang, G. & Smith, A. (2013). Grassroots innovations in
599 community energy: The role of intermediaries in niche development. *Global*
600 *Environmental Change*, *23*(5), 868–880. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.02.008

601 Harnmeijer, J, Berka, A., Bhopal, V., Robinson, S., Phimister, E., Roberts, D. & Msika, J.
602 (2015). *The Comparative Costs of Community and Commercial Renewable Energy*
603 *Projects in Scotland*. Edinburgh: ClimateXchange.

604 Hasanov, M. & Zuidema, C. (2018). The transformative power of self-organization: Towards
605 a conceptual framework for understanding local energy initiatives in The Netherlands.
606 *Energy Research & Social Science*, *37*, 85-93. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2017.09.038

607 Hauxwell-Baldwin, R. (2013). Tackling Climate Change through Community : The Politics
608 and Practice of the Low Carbon Communities Challenge. University of East Anglia.

609 Hielscher, S., Seyfang, G. & Smith, A. 2011. Community Innovation for Sustainable Energy.
610 *CSERGE Working Paper 2011-03*. Norwich: University of East Anglia

611 Hicks, J. & Ison, N. (2011). Community-owned renewable energy (CRE): Opportunities for
612 rural Australia. *Rural Society*, *20*(3), 244–255. http://doi.org/10.5172/rsj.20.3.244

613 Hicks, J. & Ison, N. (2018). An exploration of the boundaries of 'community' in community
614 renewable energy projects: Navigating between motivations and context. *Energy Policy*,
615 113, 523-534. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2017.10.031

Hodson, M., Marvin, S. & Bulkeley, H. (2013). The Intermediary Organisation of Low Carbon Cities: A Comparative Analysis of Transitions in Greater London and Greater Manchester. *Urban Studies, 50(7)*, 1403–1422. http://doi.org/10.1177/0042098013480967

Hoffman, S. M. & High-Pippert, A. (2005). Community Energy: A Social Architecture for an Alternative Energy Future. Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society, 25(5), 387-401. http://doi.org/10.1177/0270467605278880

Hoffman, S. M. & High-Pippert, A. (2010). From private lives to collective action: Recruitment and participation incentives for a community energy program. *Energy Policy*, *38*(12), 7567–7574. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2009.06.054

Hoppe, T., Graf, A., Warbroek, B., Lammers, I. & Lepping, I. (2015). Local governments supporting local energy initiatives: Lessons from the best practices of Saerbeck (Germany) and Lochem (The Netherlands). *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *7*(2), 1900–1931. http://doi.org/10.3390/su7021900

Islar, M. & Busch, H. (2016). "We are not in this to save the polar bears!" – the link between community renewable energy development and ecological citizenship. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, *29*(3), 303–319. http://doi.org/10.1080/13511610.2016.1188684

Johnson, V. & Hall, S. (2014). Community energy and equity: The distributional implications of a transition to a decentralised electricity system. *People, Place and Policy Online*, *8*(3), 149–167. http://doi.org/10.3351/ppp.0008.0003.0002

Kalkbrenner, B. J. & Roosen, J. (2016). Citizens' willingness to participate in local renewable energy projects: The role of community and trust in Germany. *Energy Research and Social Science*, *13*, 60–70. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2015.12.006

639 Kivimaa, P. (2014). Government-affiliated intermediary organisations as actors in system-
640 level transitions. *Research Policy*, *43*(8), 1370–1380.
641 http://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2014.02.007

642 Klein, S. J. W. & Coffey, S. (2016) Building a sustainable energy future, one community at a
643 time. *Renewable & Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 60, 867-880.
644 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2016.01.129

645 Koh, S. C. L. & Goucher, L. (2014) *Exploring key questions around entry to the UK energy*
646 *supply market for small firms*. Sheffield: Logistics and Supply Chain Management
647 Research Centre, University of Sheffield.

648 Kooij, H-J, Oteman, M., Veenman, S. Sperling, K., Magnusson, D., Palm, J. & Hvelplund, F.
649 (2018). Between grassroots and treetops: Community power and institutional dependence
650 in the renewable energy sector in Denmark, Sweden and the Netherlands. *Energy*
651 *Research & Social Science*, 37, p52-64, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2017.09.019.

652 Kunze, C. & Becker, S. (2015). Collective ownership in renewable energy and opportunities
653 for sustainable degrowth. *Sustainability Science*, *10*(3), 425–437.
654 http://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-015-0301-0

655 Markantoni, M. (2016). Low Carbon Governance: Mobilizing Community Energy through
656 Top-Down Support? *Environmental Policy and Governance,* 26(3), 155-169.

657 Markantoni, M. & Woolvin, M. (2015). The role of rural communities in the transition to a low-
658 carbon Scotland: a review. *Local Environment*, *20*(2), 202–219.
659 http://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2013.834880

660 McHarg, A. (2016). Community Benefit through Community Ownership of Renewable
661 Generation in Scotland : Power to the People ? *Sharing the Costs and Benefits of Energy*
662 *and Resource Activity*, 297–337.

663 Middlemiss, L. & Parrish, B. D. (2010). Building capacity for low-carbon communities: The
664 role of grassroots initiatives. *Energy Policy*, *38*(12), 7559–7566.
665 http://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2009.07.003.

666 Moss, T., Becker, S. & Naumann, M. (2015). Whose energy transition is it, anyway?
667 Organisation and ownership of the Energiewende in villages, cities and regions. *Local*
668 *Environment*, *20*(12), 1547–1563. http://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2014.915799

669 Mulugetta, Y., Jackson, T. & van der Horst, D. (2010). Carbon reduction at community scale.
670 *Energy Policy*, *38*(12), 7541–7545. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2010.05.050

671 Murphy, J. & Smith, A. (2013). Understanding transition-periphery dynamics: Renewable
672 energy in the highlands and Islands of Scotland. *Environment and Planning A*, *45*(3),
673 691–709. http://doi.org/10.1068/a45190

674 Nolden, C. (2013). Governing community energy-Feed-in tariffs and the development of
675 community wind energy schemes in the United Kingdom and Germany. *Energy Policy*,
676 *63*, 543–552. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2013.08.050

677 OECD [The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development] (2015). *Aligning*
678 *policies for the transition to a low-carbon economy*. Paris: OECD

679 Ofgem, 2015. Non-traditional business models: Supporting transformative change in the
680 energy market. *Discussion Paper.* London: Ofgem

681 Oteman, M., Wiering, M. & Helderman, J.-K. (2014). The institutional space of community
682 initiatives for renewable energy: a comparative case study of the Netherlands, Germany
683 and Denmark. *Energy, Sustainability and Society*, *4*(1), 11. http://doi.org/10.1186/2192-
684 0567-4-11

685 OVO Energy (2018). *OVO Communities.* Available online:
686 https://www.ovoenergy.com/about-ovo/communities

687 Parag, Y., Hamilton, J., White, V. & Hogan, B. (2013). Network approach for local and
688 community governance of energy: The case of Oxfordshire. *Energy Policy*, *62*, 1064–
689 1077. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2013.06.027

690 Park, J. J. (2012). Fostering community energy and equal opportunities between
691 communities. *Local Environment*, *17*(4), 387–408.
692 http://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2012.678321

693 Pinker, A. (2018) Tinkering with Turbines: Ethics and Energy Decentralisation in Scotland.
694 *Anthropological Quarterly*, 91(2).

695 Pohlmann, A. (2018): *Situating Social Practices in Community Energy Projects. Three Case*
696 *Studies about the Contextuality of Renewable Energy Production.* Book Series:
697 Energiepolitik und Klimaschutz. Energy Policy and Climate Protection. Wiesbaden:
698 Springer.

699 Rasch, E. D. & Köhne, M. (2017). Practices and imaginations of energy justice in transition.
700 A case study of the Noordoostpolder, the Netherlands. *Energy Policy*, *107*, 607-614.

701 Rogers, J. C., Simmons, E. A., Convery, I. & Weatherall, A. (2008). Public perceptions of
702 opportunities for community-based renewable energy projects. *Energy Policy*, 36(11),
703 4217-4226. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2008.07.028

704 Rogers, J. C., Simmons, E. A., Convery, I. & Weatherall, A. (2012a). What factors enable
705 community leadership of renewable energy projects? Lessons from a woodfuel heating
706 initiative. *Local Economy*, *27*(2), 209–222. http://doi.org/10.1177/0269094211429657

707 Rogers, J. C., Simmons, E. A., Convery, I. & Weatherall, A. (2012b). Social impacts of
708 community renewable energy projects: findings from a woodfuel case study. *Energy*
709 *Policy*, *42*, 239–247. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2011.11.081

710 Rydin, Y., Guy, S., Goodier, C., Chmutina, K., Devine-Wright, P. & Wiersma, B. (2015). The
711 financial entanglements of local energy projects. *Geoforum*, *59*, 1–11.
712 http://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2014.11.019

713 Schwencke, A.M., (2017). *Lokale Energie Monitor 2017*. Utrecht, The Netherlands: Hier
714 Opgewekt.

715 Scottish Government. (2017). *Scottish Energy Strategy: The future of energy in Scotland.*
716 Edinburgh: The Scottish Government

717 Seyfang, G., Hielscher, S., Hargreaves, T., Martiskainen, M. & Smith, A. (2014). A
718 grassroots sustainable energy niche? Reflections on community energy in the UK.
719 *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, *13*, 21–44.
720 http://doi.org/10.1016/j.eist.2014.04.004

721 Seyfang, G., Park, J. J. & Smith, A. (2013). A thousand flowers blooming? An examination of
722 community energy in the UK. *Energy Policy*, *61*, 977–989.
723 http://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2013.06.030

724 Seyfang, G. & Haxeltine, A. (2012). Growing Grassroots Innovations: Exploring the Role of
725 Community-Based Initiatives in Governing Sustainable Energy Transitions. *Environment*
726 *& Planning C: Politics & Space*, 30(3): 381-400.

727 Shrubsole, G. & Cameron, A. (2014). The Big Six on the Run: how renewables are
728 disrupting big energy firms everywhere. London: Friends of the Earth.

729 Simcock, N. (2016). Procedural justice and the implementation of community wind energy
730 projects: A case study from South Yorkshire, UK. *Land Use Policy*, *59*, 467–477.
731 http://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2016.08.034

732 Smith, A., Hargreaves, T., Hielscher, S., Martiskainen, M. & Seyfang, G. (2016). Making the
733 most of community energies: Three perspectives on grassroots innovation. *Environment*
734 *and Planning A*. 48(2), 407–432. https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X15597908

735 Strachan, P. A., Cowell, R., Ellis, G., Sherry-Brennan, F. & Toke, D. (2015). Promoting
736 Community Renewable Energy in a Corporate Energy World. *Sustainable Development*,
737 *23*(2), 96–109. http://doi.org/10.1002/sd.1576

738 Szarka, J. & Bludhorn, I. (2006). *Wind power in Britain and Germany: explaining contrasting*
739 *development paths*. Bath: University of Bath and Anglo-Germany Foundation for the
740 Study of Industrial Society.

741 Taylor Aiken, G. (2014). Common Sense Community? The Climate Challenge Fund's Official
742 and Tacit Community Construction. *Scottish Geographical Journal*, *130*, 207–221.
743 http://doi.org/10.1080/14702541.2014.921322

744 Taylor Aiken, G. (2015). (Local-) community for global challenges: carbon conversations,
745 transition towns and governmental elisions. *Local Environment*, *20*, 764–781.
746 http://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2013.870142

747 Taylor Aiken, G. (2016). Prosaic state governance of community low carbon transitions.
748 *Political Geography*, *55*, 20–29. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2016.04.002

749 Tingey, M., Hawkey, D. & Webb, J. (2016). Assessing local government engagement in
750 energy systems development in the UK and its likely trajectories. In Hawkey D, Webb J,
751 Lovell H, McCrone D, Tingey M, and Winskel M (Eds) *Sustainable Urban Energy Policy:*
752 *Heat and the city* (pp. 157–182). Abingdon: Routledge.

753 Toke, D., Breukers, S. & Wolsink, M. (2008). Wind power deployment outcomes: How can
754 we account for the differences? *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 12, 1129–
755 1147

van der Horst, D. (2008). Social enterprise and renewable energy: emerging initiatives and communities of practice. *Social Enterprise Journal*, *4*, 171–185. http://doi.org/10.1108/17508610810922686

van Veelen, B. (2017). Making Sense of the Scottish Community Energy Sector – An Organising Typology. *Scottish Geographical Journal*, *133*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/14702541.2016.1210820

van Veelen, B. (2018) Negotiating energy democracy in practice: governance processes in community energy projects. *Environmental Politics.* https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2018.1427824

van Veelen, B. & Haggett, C. (2016). Uncommon Ground: The Role of Different Place Attachments in Explaining Community Renewable Energy Projects. *Sociologia Ruralis, 57*, 522-554. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/soru.12128

Vansintjan, D. (2015). *The energy transition to energy democracy*. Antwerp, Belgium: RESCOOP.

Vaughan-Morris, G., McNaught, C., Morris, C. & Cheung, T. (2015) Cost and financing aspects of community renewable energy projects, Volume II: case studies – UK, Didcot: Ricardo-AEA.

Walker, G. (2008). What are the barriers and incentives for community-owned means of energy production and use? *Energy Policy*, *36*(12), 4401–4405. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2008.09.032

Walker, G. & Devine-Wright, P. (2008). Community renewable energy: What should it mean? *Energy Policy*, *36*(2), 497–500. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2007.10.019

Walker, G., Hunter, S., Devine-Wright, P., Evans, B. & Fay, H. (2007). Harnessing Community Energies: Explaining and Evaluating Community-Based Localism in

780 Renewable Energy Policy in the UK. *Global Environmental Politics*, *7*(2), 64–82.
781 http://doi.org/10.1162/glep.2007.7.2.64

782 Warbroek, B. & Hoppe, T. (2017). Modes of Governing and Policy of Local and Regional
783 Governments Supporting Local Low-Carbon Energy Initiatives; Exploring the Cases of the
784 Dutch Regions of Overijssel and Fryslân. *Sustainability*, 9(1), 75–36.
785 http://doi.org/10.3390/su9010075

786 Warren, C. R. & McFadyen, M. (2010). Does community ownership affect public attitudes to
787 wind energy? A case study from south-west Scotland. *Land Use Policy*, *27*(2), 204–213.
788 http://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2008.12.010

789 Watson, J. (2016). Back to the DTI? Merger of DECC & BIS an opportunity to integrate
790 energy & industrial policies. *UKERC News.* Available online:
791 http://www.ukerc.ac.uk/news/back-to-the-dti-the-merger-of-decc-and-bis-is-a-new-
792 opportunity-to-integrate-energy-and-industrial-policies-.html

793 Webb, J., Hawkey, D. & Tingey, M. (2016). Governing cities for sustainable energy: The UK
794 case. *Cities*, 54 (Special Issue Cities, Energy and Climate Change Mitigation), 28–35.
795 http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2015.10.014

796 Webb, J., Tingey, M. & Hawkey, D. (2017). What We Know about Local Authority
797 Engagement in UK Energy Systems: Ambitions, Activities, Business Structures & Ways
798 Forward (pp. 1–68). London and Loughborough: UKERC and ETI.

799 Weinrub, A. & Giancatarino, A. (2015). *Toward a Climate Justice Energy Platform:*
800 *Democratizing Our Energy Future*. Oakland, CA: Local Clean Energy Alliance.

801 Wirth, S. (2014). Communities matter: Institutional preconditions for community renewable
802 energy. *Energy Policy*, *70*, 236–246. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2014.03.021

803 Yildiz, O. (2014). Financing renewable energy infrastructures via financial citizen
804 participation – The case of Germany. *Renewable Energy*, 68, 677-685.